

App. No. 10/719,435
Office Action Dated October 7, 2005

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 3 and 4 are hereby amended. Claims 1 and 2 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Amendment of claim 3 is supported by page 3, lines 7-13. Amendment of claim 4 is supported by page 3, lines 17-23.

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected as being anticipated by Nagano (US 4,806,873). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 1 is canceled. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to claim 1. Nagano does not disclose a laser diode driving device including a first differentiation circuit, and a first voltage-current conversion circuit that outputs a current having the same polarity as that of a constant current source when a switch is turned on, as required by claim 3. Even if current I_s were considered equivalent to the control signal for controlling the switch required by claim 3, the signal (I_s) does not enable a current to be supplied to A_1 (rejection equates to the claimed laser diode drive current amplifier) having the same polarity as that of current 1b (the rejection equates to the claimed constant current source) when the switch (S_1) is turned on (at the leading edge of the drive current). Therefore, Nagano does not disclose or suggest any element of the laser diode driving circuit of Figure 2 that could be considered equivalent to the first differentiation circuit that differentiates a control signal for controlling the switch to be either on or off, as required by claim 3.

The first differentiation circuit, along with the first voltage-current conversion circuit of claim 3, provide a shorter rising time of the current supplied to the laser diode drive current amplifier.

Favorable reconsideration of claim 3 is requested.

App. No. 10/719,435
Office Action Dated October 7, 2005

Claims 2 and 5 were rejected as being unpatentable over Nagano in view of Tatehara (US 2003/0086456). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 2 is canceled. Claim 5 should be considered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3, from which it depends. Tatehara does not remedy the deficiencies of Nagano, as previously noted. Favorable reconsideration of claim 5 is requested. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612)455-3804.

Respectfully Submitted,



Douglas P. Mueller

Reg. No.: 30,300

Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.

225 South Sixth Street

Suite 2650

Minneapolis, MN 55402

612.455.3800

Dated: December 29, 2005



DPM:mfe